

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
3:09-cv-24-RJC-DSC**

CEDRIC MONROE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of the Social Security
Administration,**

Defendant.

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. Nos. 11, 12), Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. Nos. 13, 14), and the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendations (“M&R”) (Doc. No. 15), which recommended granting Plaintiff’s motion, denying Defendant’s motion, reversing the Commissioner’s decision, and remanding the matter for a new hearing. The parties were advised that objections were to be filed in writing within ten (10) days after service of the Magistrate Judge’s decision. (Doc. No. 15 at 10-11). The time for filing objections has since passed, and no objections have been filed by either party in this matter. For the reasons stated below, the Court will grant Plaintiff’s motion, deny Defendant’s motion, reverse the Commissioner’s decision, and remand the matter for a new hearing pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

I. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 198 (4th Cir. 1983). “By

contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, after a careful review of the record in this case, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s findings of fact are supported by the record and his conclusions of law are consistent with and supported by current case law. Thus, the Court hereby accepts the M&R of the Magistrate Judge and adopts it as the final decision of this Court for all purposes relating to this case.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 11) is **GRANTED**;
2. Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 13) is **DENIED**;
3. the Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED**; and
4. this matter is hereby **REMANDED** for a new hearing pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

Signed: October 16, 2009



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge

